UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,263	02/12/2004	Kazuo Aoki	JP9-2002-0244US1 (466)	5410

40987 7590 09/22/2008

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER	
BORSETTI, GREG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
09/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/777,263	AOKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GREG A. BORSETTI	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *17-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *17-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 have been canceled.

2. Claims 17-20 have been added and are pending.

3. The 35 USC 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. In response to applicant's argument that "the reference Morimoto and Yokogawa do not concern the same technical problem as the present invention." (Remarks, Page 5, ¶ 3), recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The argument is not persuasive.

5. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Yokogawa's method is not applicable for other languages including agglutinative languages like Japanese) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The argument is not persuasive.

6. In response to applicant's argument that "This definition intends to resolve the difficulty of lexical transfer and structural transfers, not the decomposition difficulty within morphological analysis.", recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention

must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 17 – 20 of the claimed invention are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims do not have a useful, tangible, and concrete output. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frisch et al. (US Patent #4873634 hereinafter Frisch) in view of Baker et al. (US Patent # 5754972 hereinafter Baker) and further in view of Applicants admitted prior art (Background section).

As per claim 17, Frisch teaches:

Inputting the text string to be processed (Frisch, column 3, lines 25-35, *…an improved method for generating correctly spelled example compound words in response to the inputting by the user of a misspelled compound word…*);

decomposing the text string into tokens (Frisch, columns 4-5, lines 40-67, 1-51, *…decomposition of compound words…*);

determining whether each token is decomposable (Frisch, columns 4-5, lines 40-67, 1-51, *…Once all the possible initial components have been identified, the remaining portion of the compound word is subjected recursively to the same substring-matching procedure against the dictionary, but the compounding attributes must be those of a middle or back component…*).

Frisch fails to teach, but Baker teaches:

selecting whether or not to decompose a decomposable complex word in response to a request from an application that utilizes a morphological analysis result (Baker, columns 5-6, lines 63-67, 1-5, Baker teaches the use of user input to determine when to decompose a compound (complex) word for an application in speech recognition.);

if a token is not decomposable, registering the non-decomposable token on a token list (Baker, column 9, lines 51-67, *…generates a candidate list 114 and displays that list 116, in response to the characters and formatives entered by the user…*).

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Baker with the Frisch device to have a selection process in the decomposition of compound word to increase the word recognition accuracy on compound words in speech recognition.)

Frisch and Baker fail to teach, but Applicants admitted prior art teaches:

selecting the optimum token string based on the token list

(Background, Page 3, ¶ 0007, Fig. 12).

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Applicants admitted prior art with the Baker and Frisch device to generate the most likely token string, to define the decomposable complex word such that it can be recognized efficiently from an application using the dictionary.)

As per claim 18, claim 17 is incorporated and Frisch fails to teach, but Applicants admitted prior art teaches:

wherein a master dictionary is referenced when decomposing the text string into tokens (Background, Page 3, ¶ 0006, Fig 11)

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Applicants admitted prior art with the Baker and Frisch device because the substitution of one known elements for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The Frisch and Baker device requires a dictionary for comparison. It would have been

obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art to use the master dictionary provided in Applicants admitted prior art because the master dictionary is a pre-segmented dictionary of tokens and their attributes (Page 3, ¶ 0006). Therefore, since the dictionary is already segmented, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Applicants admitted prior art with the Baker and Frisch device, because the pre-segmented dictionary reduces processing in the generation of the most likely token string to define the decomposable complex word.

As per claim 19, claim 17 is incorporated and Frisch fails to teach, but Applicants admitted prior art teaches:

wherein a grammar dictionary is referenced when selecting the optimum token string on the bases of the token list (Background, Page 3, ¶ 0007).

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Applicants admitted prior art with the Baker and Frisch device because the substitution of one known elements for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The Frisch and Baker device requires a dictionary for comparison. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art to use the master dictionary provided in Applicants admitted prior art because the master dictionary is a pre-segmented dictionary of tokens and their attributes (Page 3, ¶ 0006). Therefore, since the dictionary is already segmented, it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Applicants admitted prior art with the Baker and

Frisch device, because the pre-segmented dictionary reduces processing in the generation of the most likely token string to define the decomposable complex word.

As per claim 20, claim 18 is incorporated and Frisch fails to teach, but Baker teaches:

wherein whether a token is decomposable is determined by determining whether a decomposable flag for the token in the master dictionary is set (Baker, column 9, lines 32-35, *...the compound word recognizer 82 is responsive to a user command to decompose, into its identified formatives, a previously identified compounded word*..., the word is known to be a compound word, therefore it would have been obvious that a flag or an indicator would be set to indicate that the compound word is decomposable such that the user could choose to decompose the word.)

It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Baker with the Frisch device to have a selection process in the decomposition of compound word to increase the word recognition accuracy on compound words in speech recognition.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to PTO-892, Notice of References Cited for a listing of analogous art.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREG A. BORSETTI whose telephone number is (571)270-3885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (8am - 5pm Eastern Time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHEMOND DORVIL can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greg A. Borsetti/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

9/15/2008